

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/321,939	CARR, WAYNE J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason P. Salce	2614	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jason P. Salce. (3)_____.

(2) Fred G. Pruner, Jr. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 27 December 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: None.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant noted to submit proof of submission of the IDS filed for on August 6, 1999, which the examiner stated he would consider the references previously submitted and enter a response. The examiner noted that he had previously approved the references because the IDS was one of the first IDS papers reviewed by the examiner in the case. However, when the paper case was converted to an electronic case, the IDS was no longer entered in the file. The examiner stated that the applicant should submit the paper with proof of receipt by the USPTO, so that the paper can be re-entered into the case.